



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/536,500

08/15/2005

Keith S Perry

4058-132

6577

23448

7590

04/29/2008

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY / TECHNOLOGY LAW

PO BOX 14329

RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709

EXAMINER

CHOI, HYEJUNG

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3754

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/29/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/536,500	Applicant(s) PERRY ET AL.	
	Examiner HYEA J. CHOI	Art Unit 3754	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 May 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 10 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>25 May 2005</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the *parallel* wiring of the illuminating means must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). (Fig. 4 shows *series* wiring.) No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet” or “New Sheet” pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities. On page 6, line 22, the number 20 refers to a dispense head, but on page 9, line 30, 20 refers to a tap. Also, on page 6, line 19, the number 10 refers to a fixing plate, but on page 9, line 26, 10 refers to a fixing bracket.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-2 and 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being rejected by UK Patent Application GB 2,178,729 to Bunting (Bunting).

Bunting shows a dispenser having a modular frame and cover means, as seen in Fig. 3 and 4, connected to column 12, within which are carried conduits for delivering liquid to each tap and electrical wiring for illumination (page 1, lines 18-21 and 90-95).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 3-5 are rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bunting in view of UK Patent Application GB 2,312,201 to Prunty (Prunty).

In Reference to Claim 3

Bunting shows all claims as discussed above but is silent about using connectors at each end of a conduit so that its respective ends can be connected to a tap and to a liquid supply conduit. Prunty shows conduits that have connectors at their respective ends (See page 4, lines 18-25). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use connectors because it's well known in the art to use connectors in order to minimize fluid leakage.

In Reference to Claim 4

Both Bunting and Prunty show a dispenser in which each conduit extends beyond the top of the column by a distance sufficient to permit connection to a respective tap of the dispenser, and extends beyond the bottom of the column by a distance sufficient to permit connection to a respective liquid supply conduit. (This is stated implicitly: the liquid could not otherwise be dispensed.)

In Reference to Claim 5

Bunting is also silent about the dispenser having a coolant supply conduit and a coolant exhaust conduit, a part of the coolant supply conduit and a part of the coolant exhaust conduit being located within the column. Prunty teaches having a coolant

supply conduit (17) and a coolant exhaust conduit (18), a part of both conduits being substantially located within the column (2). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have placed the cooling conduits in the column in order to ensure that every portion of the beer line is chilled, as taught by Prunty (page 2, line 30, to page 3, line 2).

7. Claim 6 is rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bunting in view of Prunty as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of U.S. Publication 2002/0078706 to Kyees (Kyees) and U.S. Patent No. 5,979,709 to Liccioni (Liccioni).

Bunting as modified by Prunty discloses claim 5 (See rejection of claim 5), but does not disclose having a coolant supply manifold, a coolant exhaust manifold, and each manifold having a number of branch means. Kyees discloses the manifolds (abstract and paragraph 0039), and Liccioni discloses the branch means (branches 43, 52, and 54 of Fig. 1). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bunting as modified by Prunty to have the manifolds of Kyees in order to simplify the pipe arrangement. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify Bunting as modified by Prunty and Kyees to have the branch means of Kyees in order to easily accommodate changes in the dispensing arrangement, as taught by Kyees (col 6, ln 23-25).

8. Claim 9 is rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bunting in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,873,647 to Kurtz et al. (Kurtz).

Bunting discloses claim 7 and that the illuminating means are of low-voltage type. (Bunting states that strip lighting fitments are used (page 1, line 71-75). Strip lighting can be the LED type, which come in low voltages, usually 12 Volts.) However, Bunting does not disclose that the respective illuminating means are connected in parallel.

Kurtz teaches parallel wiring. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have Bunting be modified to have parallel wiring in order to prevent all the light bulbs from losing power if one light bulb burns out, as taught by Kurtz (col 4, ln 12-15).

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claim 10 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

10. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: drip trays with modular support members were not found or fairly suggested by the prior art.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. U.S. Patent No. 6,880,358 to Lucas et al. has been included because it shows a pipe arrangement similar to the applicant's.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HYE A. J. CHOI whose telephone number is (571)270-

Art Unit: 3754

5061. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday; 7:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin Shaver can be reached on (571) 272-4720. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/H. J. C./
Examiner, Art Unit 3754

/Kevin P. Shaver/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3754